REMARKS

Pending in the present application are claims 6-27 of which claims 6, 18, and 26 are independent. In the Office Action mailed on February 8, 2007, claims 6, 8-18, 20, 21, 23 and 24-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Tschauder (U.S. Pat. No. 5,296,681) in view of Kiser et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,240,601). Also in the Office Action, claims 7 and 22 were rejected under section 103(a) as unpatentable over Tschauder in view of Kiser et al. and in further view of either Yang (U.S. Pat. No. 4,532,797) or Siegenheim (U.S. Pat. No. 2,189,352) and claim 19 was rejected under section 103(a) as unpatentable over Tschauder in view of Kiser et al. and in further view of Chen (U.S. Pat. No. 6,668,843). With this Amendment, independent claims 6, 18 and 26 are amended. In reliance on the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, the present application containing claims 6-27 is in condition for allowance, and reconsideration and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Claim Rejections

Claims 6, 18 and 26 have each been amended to include elements of a device for moistening a cleanroom material. "In order to rely on a reference as a basis for rejection of an applicant's invention, the reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was concerned." *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1446, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1445 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Tschauder discloses an apparatus for hot moistening face-towels. The face-towels disclosed in Tschauder are used by "airlines and restaurants for passengers and guests to refresh themselves" (col. 1, lines 29-30). Kiser discloses a method and apparatus for conditioning textile fibers. In particular, the control system disclosed in Kiser is used to control the application of liquids to bales of cotton (see, e.g., col. 3, lines 35-37). In light of the foregoing amendments, neither Tschauder nor Kiser are in Applicant's field of endeavor, and persons having ordinary skill in the art of Applicant's invention would not look outside their field of endeavor to moistening face towels or applying liquid to bales of cotton to solve the particular problem with which Applicant's invention is concerned.

Furthermore, Tschauder and Kiser are not in analogous fields of endeavor with respect to each other. Tschauder is directed to hot moistening towels used by airlines and

restaurants, while Kiser is directed to controlling liquid applied to bales of cotton. Even assuming a person having ordinary skill in the art of Applicant's invention would look to the teachings of Tschauder, that person would not then look further to Kiser for additional guidance. There is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine the teachings of Tschauder and Kiser. The only way the teachings of Tschauder and Kiser could be relevant would be to use Applicant's own disclosure as a road map to piece together the disparate references in non-analgous fields of endeavor. However, "[o]ne cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the prior art to deprecate the claimed invention." *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 1266 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

Tschauder and Kiser do not form a proper basis for rejecting amended claims 6, 18 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), because the references are not in Applicant's field of endeavor and are not reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which Applicant's invention is concerned. Furthermore, Applicant's disclosure cannot be used as hindsight to piece together the isolated disclosures found in the two different non-analogous fields of endeavor of Tschauder and Kiser. Claims 7-17 depend from claim 1 and are allowable therewith. Claims 19-25 depend from claim 18 and are allowable therewith. Claim 27 depends from claim 26 and is allowable therewith.

CONCLUSION

The above amendments and remarks traverse the rejection of independent claims 6, 18 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Tschauder in view of Kiser. In addition, the combinations of features recited in claims 7-17, 19-25 and 27 are independently patentable, although this does not need to be specifically addressed herein since any claim depending from a patentable independent claim is also patentable. *See* M.P.E.P. § 2143.03 (citing *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)). Therefore, all pending claims 6-27 are now in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KINNEY & LANGE, P.A.

Date: 4/5/07

By: _____

Alan M. Koenck, Reg. No. 43,724
THE KINNEY & LANGE BUILDING
312 South Third Street
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1002
Telephone: (612) 339-1863
Fax: (612) 339-6580

AMK:TAG